



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CP
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,539	05/02/2005	Katsuya Togawa	M&M-079-USA-PCT	1593
27955	7590	10/31/2007		
TOWNSEND & BANTA c/o PORTFOLIO IP PO BOX 52050 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER DIRAMIO, JACQUELINE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/533,539	Applicant(s) TOGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Jacqueline DiRamio	Art Unit 1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5, 9, 10 and 16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8, 11-15 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 August 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/5/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

Applicant's amendments to claims 6 – 8 and 12 – 15, as well as the addition of new claims 18 and 19 are acknowledged.

Currently, claims 6 – 8, 11 – 15 and 17 – 19 are pending and under examination. Claims 1 – 5, 9, 10, and 16 are acknowledged as withdrawn as drawn to non-elected inventions.

Withdrawn Objections and Rejections

All previous objections to the drawings, specification, and claims are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments filed August 9, 2007.

The previous rejections of claims 7 and 12 – 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments filed August 9, 2007.

All previous claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments and arguments filed August 9, 2007.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see p13-17, filed August 9, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of the claim(s) under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Applicant's argument that the amendment to claim 6 requiring the first filter member to have "an upstream and downstream part" and "a packing density of a downstream part higher than a packing density of an upstream part" is not taught by the

Art Unit: 1641

previously applied references is found persuasive. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made and presented below.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION

Claim Objections

Claims 6 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 6, line 4, recites the terms "a downstream part" and "an upstream part," which is the second recitation for these parts, and therefore, should recited "the downstream part" and "the upstream part" in order to clearly specify that these are the same parts as discussed in line 3 of the claim.

Claim 14, line 4, recites the term "a blood accommodation part," which is the second recitation for this part, and therefore, should recited "the blood accommodation part" in order to clearly specify that this is the same part as discussed in lines 1-2 of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 6 – 8, 14, 15, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitajima et al. (US 5,876,605) in view of Kadoya (US 4,976,858).

Kitajima et al. teach a filter unit 1 (apparatus) comprising:

a first filter member 10 through which plasma can move faster than corpuscles, said first filter member having an upstream and downstream part; and

a microporous (plasma or serum separating) membrane 13 having a porosity of not more than 30% and being serially connected in a subsequent stage with the first filter member (see Figure 1; column 1, lines 58-64; column 2, lines 45-62; column 5, lines 46-52; column 6, lines 1-27; column 9, lines 14-20; and Example 1).

However, Kitajima et al. fail to teach that the first filter member has a packing density of a downstream part higher than a packing density of an upstream part in the filter member.

Kadoya teaches a filter medium that comprises a nonwoven fabric of a lower density and a filter paper of a higher density, wherein the nonwoven fabric and the filter paper are superposed in a laminated structure, and the nonwoven fabric and the filter

Art Unit: 1641

paper are disposed upstream and downstream, respectively. The nonwoven fabric 5 and filter paper 2 are placed as a layer, one on top of the other, and thermally fused together to form a single filter medium 1. The nonwoven fabric has a relatively low fiber density in the range of 0.15 to 0.25 g/cm³, and the filter paper has a relatively high fiber density in the range of 0.2 to 0.3 g/cm³. The benefit of creating a filter medium that contains a low fiber density fabric that is first contacted with the fluid to be filtered followed by a higher density filter paper is that it allows for effectively trapping relatively larger particles contained in the fluid by the entrance surface of the filter medium, wherein such surface trapping may prevent the particles from being embedded with the filter medium, which prevents clogging of the filter medium (see Figure 1; column 1, lines 56-68; column 2, lines 1-24 and lines 60-68; column 3, lines 1-30; and column 6, lines 6-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include with filter device of Kitajima et al. a first filter member that has an higher density downstream part and a lower density upstream part as taught by Kadoya because Kadoya teaches the benefit of creating a filter medium that contains a low fiber density fabric that is first contacted with the fluid to be filtered followed by a higher density filter paper in order to effectively trap relatively larger particles contained in the fluid by the entrance surface of the filter medium, wherein such surface trapping may prevent the particles from being embedded with the filter medium, which prevents clogging of the filter medium.

With respect to Applicant's claim 7, Kitajima et al. teach that the filter member serves as the first filter member 10 or 11, the microporous membrane 13 serves as a second filter member, and a third filter member 10 made of fiber having a mean fiber diameter of not less than $3.0\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ and a bulk density of about 0.02 to 0.3 g/cm^3 is provided upstream of the first filter member 10 or 11 (see Figure 1; column 5, lines 46-52; column 6, lines 1-27; and Example 1).

With respect to Applicant's claim 8, Kitajima et al. teach that the first filter member 10 is made of fiber, has a mean fiber diameter from 0.2 to $3.0\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ and a filled density from 0.02 to 0.3 g/cm^3 (see Figure 1; column 5, lines 46-62; and column 6, lines 1-4; and Example 1). Kadoya also teaches that the filter medium is made of fiber and has a filled density from 0.15 to 0.3 g/cm^3 (see column 3, lines 5-14).

With respect to Applicant's claim 14, Kitajima et al. teach that the device includes a sample intake 7 (blood accommodation part) provided upstream to the filter members, wherein an aqueous solution is added to the blood sample prior to adding the sample to the intake and filtering the sample through the first and second filter members, wherein the solution has an osmotic pressure that prevents the rupturing of blood cells, particularly erythrocytes, or the puncturing of blood cell membranes (see column 3, lines 6-67; column 4, lines 1-49; and column 5, lines 22-52). Although Kitajima et al. fail to teach the specific range of the osmotic pressure for the aqueous solution as being 200 to 300 mOsm/kg , Applicant's specification discloses that the aqueous solution has an osmotic pressure of 200 to 350 mOsm/kg , which is the osmotic pressure which prevents the breakage of erythrocytes (see Applicant's specification p36). Therefore, the

Art Unit: 1641

aqueous solution of Kitajima et al. would inherently have an osmotic pressure within Applicant's range because Kitajima et al.'s aqueous solution is also taught to contain an osmotic pressure that prevents the rupturing of blood cells, particularly erythrocytes, or the puncturing of blood cell membranes.

With respect to Applicant's claim 15, Kitajima et al. teach that the aqueous solution can contain an HL agent (internal substance) (see column 3, lines 6-67; column 4, lines 1-59; and column 5, lines 22-52).

With respect to Applicant's claims 18 and 19, Kadoya teaches that the filter medium is made of polyester-based resin (see column 2, lines 65-68; and column 3, lines 1-14).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitajima et al. (US 5,876,605) in view of Kadoya (US 4,976,858), as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Ayres (US 3,891,553).

The Kitajima et al. and Kadoya references, which were discussed in the 103(a) rejection above, fail to teach that the first filter member has a property of absorbing fibrinogen contained in blood, plasma, or a fibrinogen solution.

Ayres teaches a serum and plasma separator comprising a container, a piston, and a filter means, wherein the filter means comprises a first filter member which will pass red blood corpuscles therethrough but will not pass fibrin and fibrous constituents of blood, and a second filter member which will pass the light phase of blood but which will not pass red blood corpuscles therethrough. Therefore, the first filter member is characterized to have pore sizes which allow for the passage of red blood cells, but will

not allow the passage of particulate material, such as fibrin. Thus, the first filter member removes particles of fibrin and other particulate matter from an applied blood sample (see column 2, lines 3-39; and column 4, lines 2-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide with the first filter member of Kitajima et al. and Kadoya the property of absorbing fibrinogen as taught by Ayres because Ayres teaches the benefit of including a first filter member in a plasma or serum separating device that is characterized to have pore sizes which allow for the passage of red blood cells, but will not allow the passage of particulate material, such as fibrin, in order to effectively remove particles of fibrin and other particulate matter from an applied blood sample prior to the removal of red blood cells from the sample.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitajima et al. (US 5,876,605) in view of Kadoya (US 4,976,858), as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Bell (US 2003/0206828).

Kitajima et al. and Kadoya further fail to teach that an anticoagulant compound is stored in at least a part of the internal space of the filter apparatus.

Bell teaches a whole blood sampling device comprising a tube having a self-filling capability and that includes a blood separation filter. The filter has a plurality of pores sized to permit passage of selected blood constituents, such as blood plasma, through the device. The tube can include an anti-coagulant reagent, preferably in dry form, dispensed throughout the interior of the tube, which prevents the clotting of blood

contained within the tube, and further facilitates the flow of blood plasma from the tube through the filter (see Abstract; and paragraph [0012]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include with the filter unit of Kitajima et al. and Kadoya an anticoagulant component as taught by Bell because Bell teaches the benefit of including an anti-coagulant reagent in the interior of a blood sampling device in order to prevent the clotting of blood contained within the device, and further to facilitate the flow of blood plasma through a filter contained within the device.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitajima et al. (US 5,876,605) in view of Kadoya (US 4,976,858), as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Anraku (US 5,413,786).

Kitajima et al. and Kadoya fail to teach that an accelerator for accelerating coagulation of blood is stored in at least a part of the internal space.

Anraku teaches a method for accelerating blood coagulation by contacting blood with an accelerator comprising a metal complex. The addition of an accelerator for blood coagulation to a blood sample is beneficial because it gives a good separation effect between the serum and the blood clot, which allows for the separation of the serum from the blood clot in a high yield and without causing a change in the serum, so that the serum can be used for every kind of biochemical and clinical test (see Abstract; and column 3, lines 49-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include with the filter unit of Kitajima et al. and Kadoya an accelerator for accelerating coagulation of blood as taught by Anraku because Anraku teaches the benefit of adding an accelerator for blood coagulation to a blood sample because it gives a good separation effect between the serum and the blood clot, which allows for the separation of the serum from the blood clot in a high yield and without causing a change in the serum, so that the serum can be used for every kind of biochemical and clinical test.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitajima et al. (US 5,876,605) in view of Kadoya (US 4,976,858), as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Chu (US 6,632,681).

Kitajima et al. and Kadoya fail to teach that the filter unit contains or stores a strip of immunochromatographical diagnostic agent to be added to the separated plasma or serum.

Chu teaches a device and method for filtering a biological derived sample, such as blood, wherein the device includes a container, a filter, and a fluid flow-through matrix. The filter is used to retain debris in the liquid that would otherwise interfere with an assay for the biological sample. The matrix is used to retain a reagent that interacts in some way with the biological sample. A subsequent reaction surface is utilized with the device and method, wherein the reaction surface contains an immobilized capture reagent (strip of immunochromatographical diagnostic agent) that interacts with the

Art Unit: 1641

filtered sample, such as through an immunoassay for a sample analyte (see Abstract; column 2, lines 17-24; column 3, lines 2-41; and column 5, lines 9-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include with the filter unit of Kitajima et al. and Kadoya a reaction surface containing an immobilized capture reagent (strip of immunochromatographical diagnostic agent) as taught by Chu because Chu teaches the benefit of including a reaction surface containing an immobilized capture reagent with a device and method for filtering a biological sample in order to receive and interact with the filtered sample, and to allow for the subsequent immunoassay of a desired sample analyte.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any


Art Unit: 1641

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline DiRamio whose telephone number is 571-272-8785. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Jackie DiRamio
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641


LONG V. LE 10/26/07
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600